UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,127	01/28/2004	Vidya Narayanan	CM05054H	4361
22917 MOTOROLA,	7590 04/05/200° INC.	EXAMINER		
1303 EAST AL	GONQUIN ROAD	AJAYI, JOEL		
IL01/3RD SCHAUMBUR	.G, IL 60196	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2617	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/05/2007	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/05/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com APT099@motorola.com

<del></del>		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/767,127	NARAYANAN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Joel Ajayi	2617			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 J	anuary 2004.				
·		s action is non-final.	•			
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under l	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) 🗌	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
·	DIX Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 2004 is/are	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected	to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
•	w.)					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application			

Art Unit: 2617

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- Determining the scope and contents of the prior art. 1.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gage et al. (U.S.

Patent Application Number: 2002/0068584) in view of Forslow (U.S. Patent Application

Number: 2002/0069278).

Consider claim 1; Gage clearly discloses a system comprising at least a first device (wireless device), a second device (network edge router) and a routing infrastructure comprising a plurality of routers (intermediate routers) used to communicate information between the first device and the second device (paragraph 63, lines 1-14; paragraph 84, lines 1-19), a method comprising the steps of: at the first device (paragraph 63, lines 1-14; paragraph 84, lines 1-19): receiving an anycast address (in order for the wireless device to use the anycast address, it has to receive it) (paragraph 63, lines 1-14; paragraph 84, lines 1-19); injecting an updated route to the anycast address into the routing infrastructure each time the first device moves to a different subnet (paragraph 63, lines 1-14; paragraph 84, lines 1-19); sending a binding update to the second device informing the second device of the anycast address (paragraph 63, lines 1-14; paragraph 84, lines 1-19); and receiving information from the second device via the anycast address regardless of a location of the first device in the system (paragraph 62, lines 1-5; paragraph 63, lines 1-14; paragraph 84, lines 1-19).

Except:

Roaming to a different subnet.

In the same field of endeavor Forslow clearly discloses roaming to a different subnet (paragraph 27, lines 17-37; paragraph 100, lines 13-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Forslow into the method of Gage in order to provide secure communication to and within an overlaid workgroup network while applying mobility management.

Consider claim 2-12; the combination above clearly discloses that the anycast address is topologically independent (Gage, paragraph 62, lines 1-5; paragraph 63, lines 1-14; paragraph 84, lines 1-19; Forslow, paragraph 27, lines 17-37; paragraph 100, lines 13-16).

### Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

# Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Joel Ajayi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1091. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2617

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-

2600.

Joel Ajayi

March 28, 2007

MICK OFFICE TANIBED

CUPERVISION